COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

. 17.] London, Saturday, 15th May, 1802. [Price 10D.

TENTS.—Let. on Gum Trade, 545. Mr. Cobbett's Answ. 548. Mr. Cobbett's Let. to Sir F. Eden on the Tr. 552. Meet. of Ship-Own. 559. Proceed. in Parl. 562. French Com. Regu. 569. Prince Wales' Let. to Sheriffs, 571. Proposed Address to the King, 572. Buonaparté proposed Consul for Life, 574.

TO THE EDITOR.

Gum Trade.

Sir,

Melancholy as the prospect of Great-Bri- n now appears, and supinely as her rulers m disposed to abandon all her nearest dearest interests to the rapacious gripe France, it behoves all, who love the ex- nce of their country, and have gloried her prosperity, to contribute the little e of their abilities for the preservation what yet remains to her. If ever, after ng and bloody war, it has been neces- y, that the limits of commercial and ter- rial rights between the contending na- ns should be clearly and unequivocally ined, it certainly must have been after h a war, as we have now sustained; in ich the fundamental government of our l has been wholly subverted, and all its me, qualities, and relations modelled n a new character. Much has been d, and more will be considered, in both uses of Parliament, upon the unprecedent- omission of the revival of ancient treaties that, which we have now concluded; d many valuable rights have been enu- erated, which are supposed to have been ld by no other title than these extin- ishing treaties. Let us be careful how proceed at this momentous crisis, after ratification of such a peace, if peace it y be called, which is pregnant with new stilities. It was publicly and officially clared at the signature of the peace in 83, that the abrogation of subsisting eaties would throw commerce into infi- e confusion; how much more forcible ust be its effects, when the government, on whose ancient faith the basis of our mmercial intercourse was established, is nulled, and its place supplied by a new overnment, and new race of legislators! is a subject worthy of the consideration those, who are better able to decide upon than I am, whether on the termina- on of war, which interrupted all treaties, ey do not *of themselves revive*, unless ex- ressly altered or annulled by new stipula- ons. I believe this will not be found a ovel idea; and a strong argument, that such was the opinion of those, who signed the treaty of 1783, may be drawn from the use of the words "abrogation of *sub-* "*sisting treaties*," instead of *non-revival of ancient treaties*. No argument can be collected on the other side from the *practice* of stipulating for their renewal, which is solely to be attributed to the jealous care, with which our ancient negotiators avoided the possible admission of a dangerous cavil. They stipulated generally for the renewal of all treaties, but were not satisfied with this security, without likewise inserting the names of particular important treaties, which, though not enumerated, would by the general clause have been equally confirmed. I will not dwell on this question, which will find abler advocates in Parliament; the point, to which I am desirous of drawing the public attention, is our right to the gum trade, which Lord G. and Mr. W. have stated to be wholly done away by the extinction of these treaties; and (unfounded as this opinion to me appears) ministers either careless, or ignorant of the subject, have silently assented to its truth. But, though I humbly hope to demonstrate, that this right has not been ceded to France, and that it is wholly unconnected with the non-renewal of ancient treaties, how uncertain is the predicament of this country, when men of such abilities, and so zealous for its welfare, can for a moment believe our rights to be extinguished; when the negligence or impotence of ministers have reduced us to the perilous alternative of yielding them to the rapacity of our enemies, or maintaining them by cavil, without any tribunal to judge them, but the imperious court of France, or any appeal from her decisions, but to the enfeebled sword of Great-Britain!

To determine whether, or not, we still possess a right to participate in the gum trade, we must consider the origin of that right, and of the right of France to the territory, upon which it is exercised. If the absolute sovereignty of Senegal was vested in France, and the right of trading in its dependencies had been granted by her to Great-Britain, by the extinction of that grant, the right of trade would un-

doubtedly expire. But I contend, that the complete and unlimited sovereignty of Senegal does not belong to France, and that the trade in question was carried on not by her permission or sufferance, but by the unceded right of Great-Britain. By the treaty of 1763, Senegal, with all its dependencies, which extend northward round the Bays of Portendic and Arguin to Cape Blanco, was ceded to Great-Britain in full right, without any reservation or restriction. A share in the gum trade was ensured to France by the restitution of Goree; and Great-Britain remained for twenty years in full possession of the settlements of Senegal, till their cession was demanded by France at the conclusion of the American war. The English could procure slaves from their settlements on the Gambia, and the chief value of Senegal was the participation in the gum trade, which it secured to them. It was ceded therefore to France in 1783, with a reservation of liberty for British merchants to carry on this trade on the coast between Portendic and the River St. John, a portion of the dependencies of Senegal, on condition that these merchants should form there no permanent settlement. The French therefore acquired in Senegal not an absolute sovereignty, but a qualified territorial right, without any power of excluding the British traders from a part of this district. In the late war Great-Britain recovered Senegal, and by the treaty just concluded she stipulates generally to restore all the conquests, which she has made in the course of it. What then does she restore to France in Africa? An absolute sovereignty over Senegal, subject to no limitations, or restrictions? No, for this France did not possess; this was not wrested from her. She held Senegal subject to certain British rights, and the same estate, which she before possessed there, is now restored to her. But the British right to trade on the coast from Portendic to the St. John, which our ministers refused to cede in 1783, has not been ceded by the last treaty. Great-Britain holds it by virtue of her conquests in 1758; in 1783 she ceded the territorial rights, reserving this; and by the present confirmation of that cession she still retains that trade, which she had reserved, whole and unimpaired; and any attempt of the French to interrupt her merchants in the enjoyment of this their unequivocal right will be a direct renewal of hostilities. That this valuable right remains still to Great-Britain, with all due deference to the opinion of the noble lord, who has so ably expatiated on the defects of this treaty, I am firmly convinced; that our present ministers will cast this gem of our commercial crown at the feet of France, I am much disposed to fear.

I am yours, &c.

W—— H——.

May 6, 1802.

TO W—— H——.

Sir,

To the sentiments expressed in the introductory part of your letter, it is hardly necessary for me to signify my hearty assent. The situation of our enemy, our own situation, the disjointed state of the world in general, did, indeed, in the formation of a treaty, by which, it was obvious, that the enjoyment of our future commercial and territorial rights must be materially affected, call for an unusual degree of caution and firmness. The instrument, however, to which your observations refer, and the defects of which are, at this moment, the subject of parliamentary discussion, bears not the slightest trace of either of these qualities, but exhibits, on the contrary, the combined effects of ignorance, carelessness, and pusillanimity.

Agreeing as we do as to the general tenour and tendency of this treaty, I am nevertheless afraid that we entertain opposite opinions with regard to certain particular points of it. You seem to have adopted the supposition, that all the treaties existing, previous to the war, between the hostile powers, *revive of themselves* at the termination of such war, unless expressly altered or annulled by new stipulations: I, on the contrary, am fully persuaded, that all the treaties, existing before the war, between the opposite belligerent powers, do, from the commencement of the war, cease and determine for ever, unless expressly renewed in the treaty of peace, or in some subsequent compact. To a writer, Sir, of your acuteness, I should, in any case, be loath to oppose my feeble and inexperienced pen, and my confidence is, I assure you, by no means strengthened by the reflection, that I am asserting the rights of France in opposition to the interests and honour of England.

That *the best* argument, against your position, is not to be collected from the practice of stipulating for the renewal of former

…ties, is readily acknowledged; but, that …rgument can therefrom be collected for …t purpose, I must take the liberty to …y. Great part of the public law of …rope, like the common law of particular …es, derives its origin from *custom*, and …ceeds altogether upon precedent. A …g continued practice becomes a tacit …venant, which is, to all intents and pur…es, binding on the parties to the con…ct. Of this nature, I presume, is the …ctice of Great-Britain in constantly re…wing all the former treaties and stipula…ns, on which she intended to found any …ture claim or pretension, and which she …l not acknowledge to be thenceforth an…lled and of non-effect. This practice is …nsidered, and fairly considered, as an evi…nce of her own construction of the law … this respect; and, in fact, she has, in …re than one instance, acted upon this …nstruction towards other powers with …om she has refused to renew former …aties.

How your argument derives strength …m the circumstance, that those who sign… the treaty of 1783, used the words *…abrogation of* EXISTING *treaties*, instead of *…non-revival of* ANCIENT *treaties*," I must …nfess myself at a loss to discover. If, …cording to your idea, all the treaties, …hich existed before the war, revived of …emselves at the close of it, where was …e necessity of renewing them? The words *…isting treaties* certainly meant, treaties *ex…ing at the breaking out of the war*, and, …mongst those were to be found all the …cient *treaties*, from the treaty of West…halia downwards. Therefore, the distinc…on which you have drawn is perfectly …ugatory; it discovers no difference in the …ings spoken of, and contributes nothing …wards the support of your argument.

But, Sir, I cannot be content to rest my …osition solely on the practice of stipulat…g for the renewal of former treaties. I …ust beg leave to refer to the maxims laid …own by the civilians of Europe, all of …hom are unanimous in declaring, that, treaties, properly so called, cease to be obligatory, 1. when the sovereign power with whom they were concluded ceases to exist; 2. when the state passes under the dominion of another power; 3. sometimes, when a state changes its constitution; 4. and *always* when a *war*, on whatever account, *breaks out between the contracting parties*, except it may be such provisions contained in them as have "been made in the case of war,"* such, for instance, as are to be found in the tenth article of our present treaty with the American States. On the same side with yourself SIR FREDERICK MORTON EDEN has quoted VATTEL, who says, that, "the state "of things at the instant of making the "treaty is held to be legitimate, and any "change to be made in it requires an ex"press specification in the treaty; conse"quently all things not mentioned in the "treaty, are to remain *as they were at the "conclusion of it*."† VATTEL does not here speak in reference to actual possession, or enjoyment, but to rights and pretensions; and, therefore, his doctrine fully confirms the antecedent maxim of former treaties being abrogated by war. "All things not "mentioned in the treaty, remain as they "were at the *conclusion* of it." The war abrogated all former treaties; they were in that state at the conclusion of the peace, and, as they are not mentioned in the treaty, they remain as they were at that conclusion, that is to say, null and void.

As we are speaking of what France has a *right* to do, and not of what she *will* do, in consequence of the treaty of Amiens, I shall not urge, in support of my argument, the construction which she and Holland have already put upon the omission, on our part, to renew former treaties. Neither shall I, in speaking of the *gum trade*, on which point also I differ from you in opinion, cite the decree by which she has, even during the negotiation, cut off our share of that trade; but shall confine myself solely to the question of *right*.

That France did not, by the treaty of 1783, obtain the unlimited sovereignty of Senegal, and that the gum trade was not carried on by her permission, but by the *unceded* right of Great-Britain, I think there is, at least, great reason to doubt. By article IX, of the treaty of 1783, "the "King of Great-Britain cedes, in *full right*" the territory in question to France. Article X. treats of another subject; and article XI, after making provision with respect to boundaries on and near the Gambia, says, that, "as to the gum trade, the English "shall have the *liberty* of carrying it on, "from the mouth of the River St. John,

---

* MARTENS, C. I. B. II. Sec. 8. Where several authorities are cited.

† VATTEL, B. IV. Sec. 21.

" to the Bay and Fort of Portendic exclu-
" sively."

Now, Sir, upon a closer view of the premises, does it not appear, that you have been rather hasty in your conclusion? France first obtains the "*full* right" to the territory, and she afterwards gives us the *liberty* to carry on the gum trade. *Full right* is certainly synonimous with *unlimited sovereignty*, as *liberty*, in this instance, is with *permission*, or *sufferance*. Our right to carry on the trade does not appear to me to be *reserved* by us, but *granted* by France. The cession of the sovereignty and the granting of the permission are, indeed, found in one and the same compact, but this circumstance alone does not give to the latter the character of a legal *reservation*. Reservations are otherwise worded, and are always immediately connected with the cession from which they are an exception, instances of which occur in almost every treaty.

I am not, however, anxious to lay much stress upon this point; because, allowing that the right to the gum trade was "*ceded*" in the treaty of 1783; allowing that we *reserved* this right by that treaty; still we cannot, I presume, maintain, that this reservation is not *now* extinguished, seeing that the treaty of 1763 is totally obliterated. If, as you contend, we reserved the right of the gum trade in the treaty of 1783, we certainly do not forfeit it by stipulating to restore to France what we have conquered from her during the war; because we could not conquer from her that which we had reserved to ourselves; but we forfeit it not less effectually by omitting to renew the treaty of 1763, which, according to your own argument, was the only title by which we held it. From the treaty of 1763 it is that you derive our right; by that treaty we obtained from France the unlimited sovereignty of Senegal and its dependencies, a portion of which sovereignty, as you contend, we reserved in a subsequent treaty; and, if this be so, our right, so reserved, was founded upon the treaty of 1763, every stipulation of which treaty, together with all the rights and immunities arising therefrom, are now completely abrogated by the omissions of the treaty of Amiens.

I am,
Sir,
Yours, &c.

Wm. Cobbett.

Pall-Mall, May 11, 1802.

TO SIR FREDERICK M. EDEN, BART.

Sir,

The second edition of your *Letters on the Peace* I have perused with attention. Your retrenchments, as far as they have gone, are very judicious; and I am truly sorry to remark, that the parts which you have added do not seem to be entitled to the same commendation. To defend the Definitive Treaty is a task of much greater difficulty than that of defending the Preliminaries. The bare enumeration of the vices of this compact, unaccompanied with comment, would have occupied a much larger space than you have employed in what you appear to regard as a refutation of all the objections urged against the treaty, whether in parliament or elsewhere. So laconic a mode of treating the subject might have been excused during the prevalence of the "delirium of joy;" but, now that reflection has resumed its sway, now that the apprehensions of the nation are awakened, something more, Sir, is required to remove them than mere dogmatical assertion, something more than a repetition of hacknied and inapplicable maxims.

As you have advanced nothing worthy of the name of argument in support of your assertions, I by no means feel myself called upon to reply to them; yet I cannot suffer them to pass altogether unnoticed.

You set out, Sir, with a quotation from VATTEL, intended to prove, that the treaties existing, before the war, between the nations opposed to each other in such war, do not cease, though not renewed at the peace. In my letter to W— H——, p. 549, I think you will find a satisfactory answer to this part of your remarks; if you should not, however, you will find it in your own words, in p. 191 of your pamphlet, where, in speaking of the honour of the flag, you observe, that "our negotiators acted wisely "in not insisting on the revival of this an-"cient punctilio," the *abolition* of which is, with you, a subject of joy. Now, Sir, if this punctilio, as you call it, be abolished by the non-renewal of any former treaties or stipulations with the Dutch, does it not follow that every other right founded on former treaties is also abolished by such non-renewal? There are persons who maintain, that the honour of the flag is one of those rights which remain unimpaired by the omission to renew former treaties; because it is a right of prescription, which

, indeed, been recognized by, but which es not its origin to, stipulations of any t between the parties. On this point ere is certainly room for doubt; but, if a ht thus fortified be, as you acknowledge is, abolished by the omission in the treaty, t omission must necessarily work a forfeiture of all those rights which had their igin and continuance in stipulation alone. With respect to India, your notions of e effects of this treaty are not more free om confusion. You seem to regard the ipulations of the convention of 1787 as ntaining *concessions* to France, whereas ey contain, from France to us, a concesn of the right to restrain her commerce d jurisdiction in a part of the world, here she always had, or pretended to ve, an original right of commerce and risdiction equal to our own. Perceiving, owever, that the law is no very safe ound to stand on, you observe, that rance cannot easily interfere in our trade, hile she is "watched by the civil and *military* powers of British India;" that r rights of sovereignty in Asia "are *indisputable*; that France, indeed, has *never recognized them*, but that they are not less secure on that account, and, that *while we have the means of defending the territory*, it is held on as firm a tenure as that which secures to the French Republic either Savoy or Belgium." This is very ue, Sir, but what has this to do with ace? While we have the means of deending our "empire in the East," I trust God that no minister will ever be found ase enough to give it up; though, after hat we have seen, we ought not to be too onfident. I trust we shall not want the ower to defend this empire, and to preerve all its benefits exclusively to ourselves; ut *power* does not confer *right*, nor will he success of arms atone for the negligence f negotiators. You are naturally led to ut the question on the issue of the sword, hile I contend that we ought to have had he intervening security of a treaty. I am, ndeed, ready to allow, that no very great onfidence can be placed in any promise on he part of France; the ministers think ifferently; but, whatever degree of security any treaty with Buonaparté can give, hatever obstacle such an instrument may, n any case, be presumed to oppose to his ishes, we have, with respect to the comerce and sovereignty of India, most assurdly relinquished by the non-renewal of ormer treaties.

On the abrogation of the right to cut logwood and mahogany in the Bay of Honduras, you observe, that Great-Britain has stipulated to *restore* only such places as she has conquered during the war, and that, as she occupied Honduras before the war, the giving that up cannot be included in the stipulation. If you are jesting on this point, your jest is very dull; and if you are serious I know of no epithet nor of any assemblage of epithets wherewith to give an adequate description of your absurdity. The right of which we are speaking never had any other foundation than that of special agreement between the Kings of England and Spain, the latter of whom was always the sole sovereign of the soil in the province of Honduras. We traded to that province, we built huts and cut wood there, by his permission, secured to us by the treaties existing before the war. From the commencement of the war the permission ceased, and, do you really imagine, Sir, that our continuing to cut wood without permission, during the war, is a proof of our having a right to continue to cut wood during the peace? Because a tenant has kept possession of your house six months after the expiration of his lease, shall he thereon found a right to possess it for ever after? Upon a pretension like this, however, it is that you support our right to trade to Honduras, and boldly declare, that Great-Britain will not *allow* Spain to avail herself of the right of ejectment, which I contend she has obtained by the non-renewal of former treaties. Take care, Sir, how you engage for the firmness of Great-Britain in this respect. The *Mercure de France*, No. 46—5 Floreal, an 10, has said, that "the cutting of logwood and mahogany, in the province of Honduras, was "another right granted by Spain to the "English, who, perhaps, set less value upon the wood, than upon the contraband "trade, which they carried on under cover "of the right of cutting it." Mark the sequel: "*the Bay of Honduras is, by the "treaty of Amiens, freed from this double tribute.*" So says Buonaparté, Sir Frederick, and Buonaparté is universally acknowledged to be the most able publicist in Europe. You have, however, asserted, that our right to trade to Honduras remains unimpaired; and it is, therefore, the duty of our ministers to defend us in the exercise of that right, a duty which I am very much deceived if they will thank you for having imposed upon them. This remark applies with equal force to every other right, the existence of which is, in consequence of the

omissions of the treaty, become a matter of dispute. The language of the country to the ministers is this: "either you have "given up these rights, or you have not; "if you have, then do you merit all the "reproach that has been bestowed on you; "if you have not, let us now see whether "you will defend us in the enjoyment of "these rights." Rest assured, Sir, that orders are already gone from Spain to drive out our cutters of logwood, and you need not be told that France has made and promulgated a decree prohibiting our further exercise of the gum trade. According to your doctrine the enforcing of these prohibitions will be an act of hostility, and, it follows of course, that we may be, in a few months, if we are not at the present moment, actually engaged in another war for the recovery of a small portion of that, which, previous to the treaty, we had the secure possession. "Not so," say the advocates of the peace: "we will not con-"tend for trifles." Dr. Beeke, Mr. Chalmers, and yourself, will most clearly demonstrate, that the net proceeds of no one right are sufficient to balance the expense of a war, however short its duration. Upon this principle the treaty of Amiens has been concluded; upon this principle right after right will be yielded, 'till the old lion, deprived, one by one, of his teeth and his claws, will fall beneath the club of his crafty assailant.

From Honduras I shall now follow you to Louisiana. And here your notions, which have been gradually towering towards the regions of folly, seem to have attained their summit. You affect to believe, that, because this immense country was formerly of little use to France, it will be of little use to her now. Is this a fair mode of reasoning, Sir? Does the change which has taken place in the distribution of West-India colonies merit no consideration? Are the actual settlement and most successful cultivation of the lands on the eastern bank of the Mississippi, together with the trade and navigation arising therefrom, circumstances that make no difference between the present and the former possession of the command of that river? Is the discovery (for it is a discovery and a recent one too) that cotton can be produced in abundance in Louisiana, and at a very trifling expense; is this of no importance? Because the city of New Orleans, when before possessed by France, consisted of a few shabby huts, is it now of no value when [illegible] to her with a numerous popu-

lation and a port crowded with ships? As well might you contend, that the ports of Holland are of no importance, because the spot where they now stand was formerly covered by the sea.

You say that disputes will arise between France and the United States, and that "jealousies will be created that will induce "the Americans *to court the friendship of* "*Great-Britain.*" You should not, Sir, have borrowed this notion from the Register, p. 201, without an attempt, at least, to refute the arguments there advanced to show that the notion, if entertained, would prove falacious. Those who have considered this subject are convinced, that the cession of Louisiana to France will tend totally to *destroy* our connection with the United States; and, to change their opinion will require reasons, which if you have at your command, you do not choose to employ them, a mode of proceeding which is rather ungenerous, considering the desparate situation of the cause that you have espoused.

"The Mississippi," you tell us, "is not "advantageously situated for supplying the "French West-Indies with lumber and "provisions," because "a voyage from "New Orleans to St. Domingo, in the "teeth of the trade wind, could not be "effected in less time than a voyage from "Brest." Allowing, for a moment, the truth of this latter assertion, how does it take from the utility of Louisiana as a source of lumber and provisions? If there are none of these articles at Brest, and if they are found in abundance at New Orleans, the possession of the latter is certainly an acquisition of great value to France, though it be, in point of sailing, of equal distance from the place where the articles are wanted. But, this is not so. Seven days sail brings a vessel (all the way *before* the wind, and not in the *teeth* of it) from New Orleans to Savannah, supposing even that to be necessary; and the trip from Savannah to St. Domingo is frequently performed in a week. What then becomes of your assertion? And where is the consolation that it was charitably intended to convey to the bosoms of your readers? Last year, Sir, there was conveyed down the Mississippi, lumber and provisions to the amount of more than a million sterling. What became of it? According to your idea it must have been used at the mouth of the river, or thrown into the sea; for, if it could go any where it could go to the West-Indies. And, wherever it went, it must have gone as cheap as from Massa-

setts, or New Jersey, else it would have n supplanted in the market by the pro- ce of those of other States. In fact, Sir, is is a matter on which you were totally informed, or which you were resolved st grossly to misrepresent.

The cotton lands, too, falling under the pe of France, will, you think, be of no nsequence to us, because, though, by the ce we lose Tobago and other colonies ence the chief supply of cotton has been ived, and though the French and Dutch y refuse to furnish us with that neces- y article, "*any quantity of* this article may be obtained *from Surat and Bombay*." may any quantity of potatoes, as far as know; but they would come to Covent rden much dearer than the potatoes sed at Gravesend or Battersea, as the cot- n of India will come to Manchester dearer an that of New Orleans. It is not the taining of the material, but the ob- ning of it at a *cheap rate*, that constitutes e advantage of possessing the lands on hich it grows. Those who obtain their tton cheapest will be able to sell their tton goods cheapest, and those who sell eapest will have the preference in the rket.

I should, by way of conclusion, make me remarks on what you say respecting e honours of the flag, the cession to ance in Guiana, and the arrangement of alta; but, really, Sir, your manner of eating these important subjects is so flip- nt, so disgustingly puerile, so much be- ath your talents as a writer, and so totally worthy of your feelings as an English ntleman, that I am loath to yield to the pulse of that indignation, which alone uld furnish an appropriate reply.

I am,
Sir,
Your most humble
and obedient Servant,
Wm. Cobbett.

ll Mall, May 12, 1802.

TONNAGE DUTY.

A general and numerous meeting of SHIP-OWNERS s held on Thursday the 6th instant, at the London vern, to receive the report of the committee, and determine on such further measures which it ght be adviseable to adopt respecting the tonnage ty, and the present state of the shipping interest of eat-Britain.

Mr. Hill was unanimously called to the chair.

The meeting commenced by confirming the reso- ions of the last general meeting and of the com- ittee.

The Chairman then shortly reported the result of the interview of the committee with the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that they had endeavoured to point out and convince him of the evil consequences which would arise from his extending the principles of taxation to shipping, which had always been cautiously avoided by his predecessors, and stated to him the present low rate of British shipping, in consequence of the peace and the manifest advantages which foreign shipping would derive from the proposed tax. That it had been the practice of all former parliaments to encourage, by every legislative act, the increase of British shipping, and at this time such encouragement was more particularly required from the ability of foreigners to build and navigate their ships at much less expense than the British ship-owners.—The chairman said, that their representations were heard by the minister with great attention, but that they were unable to convince him of the injurious tendency and impolicy of it, nor could they prevail upon him to recede from his intention of imposing it.

The Chairman then said, that it would be proper to consider of what was farther necessary to be done on this occasion, when *Mr. J. Robinson* proposed the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to.

RESOLVED, "That it is the unanimous opinion "of the ship-owners present at this meeting, That "from the present state of Europe, there is every "reason to apprehend the shipping of this country "will decline, and that any tax on that species of "property will be attended with the utmost danger "to the state, by diminishing the great nursery of "our seamen, and weakening the source of national "defence."

Upon which *Mr. Hill* said, that in stating the result of the interview alluded to, he did not feel himself at liberty to relate publicly all the conversation which had passed, he considered it as a private communication, and therefore had adverted to it with great delicacy. For his own part, and he was sure that he spoke the sentiments of the meeting, he should be the last man in the world to oppose any just and equitable tax, but when one was proposed which tended most seriously not only to the oppression of individuals, but to sap and finally to destroy the strength of the empire, he should consider himself unjustifiable if he were not to use every effort to avert the calamities it would produce by being passed into law, or if so, that it should continue.

It was perfectly true that the affairs of the nation, after the enormous expenses that had been incurred in the conflict in which we had been engaged, could not go on without large contributions being made by the inhabitants, and which would, in some cases, inevitably fall heavily on particular classes of the community. But it was equally true, that it was the duty of every minister to raise the supplies from sources the least objectionable, and which would the least tend to affect the maritime power of the country. He said he had perused the debates of the House on this important subject, when the resolution was passed, and read, with every attention it merited, the reasons assigned by its supporters; but expressed astonishment that those gentlemen who were so ready to enter into contest with the ministers, and dispute about pounds, shillings, pence and farthings, did not think it worth their while to bring forward their talents on an occasion so important. He craved the patience of the meeting whilst he made some observations on the reasons given for bringing forward this

inauspicious measure. It was first stated, that the ship-owners had carried on a gainful trade during the late war, and therefore ought to contribute during the peace to the expenses the public had incurred. If, said Mr. Hill, the ship-owners did carry on an advantageous business during the war, did they not, during that period, contribute their quota by the income tax, &c. and is there any greater reason why ship-owners should be marked out as objects of taxation on account of their profits during the war, more than the farmers, compared to whom the profits of the ship-owners were nothing, and if there was any weight in that argument, the legislature might, with the same propriety, tax ploughs, harrows, and other articles of agriculture.—Much stress had been laid upon a statement of the exports and imports of this country, and the value of merchandize exported confounded with the increase of shipping, that such was by no means a fair criterion it was easy to demonstrate. He would, for example, take the comparative estimate of four years immediately preceding the war; it appeared, that in the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, taking the average of those years, that the number of tonnage of British ships cleared at the Custom-House, was 1,312,570, and of foreign ships 140,686; and the number of British ships cleared out in the year 1792 is 1,396,003, and of foreign ships 169,151, making an increase of British shipping of 83,425, or nearly one-fifteenth, and an increase of foreign shipping of 28,470, or nearly one-fifth. The value of goods exported on the average of the three former years, is £20,955,137, and in the latter year £24,905,200, being an increase of near one-fifth. If, therefore, the value of exports had increased one fifth, and in the same period the number of British ships no more than one-fifteenth, he must indeed be a bold man who would argue that the increase of one is a criterion to judge of the increase of the other. It further appeared, that instead of British shipping having increased within that time from the increase of exports and imports, that the vessels of foreigners had experienced almost all the encouragement which had arisen from that source. The numbers of foreign ships had increased one-fifth, whilst British ships, as before stated, had only increased one-fifteenth.—He had taken up this calculation at a period antecedent to the war; it was perfectly needless, he conceived, for him to state that there was an infinitely greater proportion of foreign shipping engaged in the exportation of British merchandize subsequent to that period. It was a well known fact that British shipping had since the peace fallen in value from 30 to 50 per cent.; and that there was every reason to expect a greater diminution of the carrying trade. Could it be for a moment doubted, that when Surinam, Essequibo, Demarara, and all the other possessions of the Dutch were restored, and the French possessions given up, but that there would be a far greater number of British shipping unemployed, as our naval power during the war had made this country the grand emporium of Europe.—In estimating the state of the Continent, we ought to take into our account the situation of the neighbouring states, and more particularly of those who had been our constant and natural rivals, and may, perhaps, within no long time, as they had heretofore been, be our inveterate enemies. Most justly had it been said, that as to capital, national honour, and good faith, this country stood unrivalled, and possessed spirit capable of surmounting every difficulty. To what did we owe those national characteristics of which no man was prouder than himself?—to the excellence of our constitution—the due administration of our laws—to that principle of justice, that security to persons and property which pervaded every part of the empire. But capital, like water, would always find its level; if the frenzy of revolution should subside, and resolve itself into a new system of government, by giving security to persons and property, what assurance have we that British capital will not float there? To our navigation, to those seamen who were ready trained to meet the enemy and to break his force at the first onset, to the wise system of former policy, that pursued one uniform conduct of encouraging instead of depressing British shipping—it was to this policy we principally owed all our splendid victories, our national wealth and character. —Can the achievements of British seamen be so soon forgotten?—They must long be remembered—at Camperdown—at Brest—at Cape St. Vincent—at Cadiz—at Gibraltar—and even the distant banks of the Nile. The very pyramids of Egypt had reverberated with the sound of British thunder.—It had been said that the French, in a late important expedition, were obliged to employ men of war to carry troops for want of merchant ships. By what means were they reduced to that situation? It cannot be forgotten that it was owing to the valour of British seamen which compelled the united fleets of France, Spain and Holland to hide their diminished heads in their harbours, which at the same time destroyed their commerce, and blocked up their ports and their merchant ships from the Elbe to the Gulf of Lyons, where they had rotted. And shall these men, whose services may be so soon wanted again be, from the want of employment in British shipping driven to seek it in foreign ports? Dr. Adam Smith, whom he said he might with propriety stile the philosopher of commerce, justly estimated the value of our navigation laws. He says, that "all our greatness is owing to "the navigation acts being kept strictly in force." It was a most singular circumstance that those navigation laws should be framed under the despotism of a tyrant and usurper, and that a contrary system of policy should be adopted in the reign of a patriot and paternal king, and by an enlightened and moderate minister. Mr. Hill, observing some persons taking notes, earnestly requested that what he had said might not be construed into a want of respect to the government; it was one of the greatest blessings under it, that every individual who was oppressed had his complaints attended to. Ministers were but men, and though of superior talents, could not know all things by intuition. He conceived it to be the duty of every good subject to give them the best information. They were often deceived by visionary projectors, and it was the duty of practical men to endeavour to set them right. The ship-owners had the consolation to think, that whilst they struggled for their own privileges, they were engaged on a subject which it was the interest of the whole kingdom to support. The tax was said to be only *experimental*, but he could not conceive how such an idea could be adopted by wise and considerate men. The experiment would be most impolitic; if we should ever be unable to beat the fleets of our enemies, as we had hitherto done, at the first commencement of a war, it would not only be injurious to this country, but to Europe. Really the measure reminded him forcibly of the old fable, where the lion was prevailed upon to shorten his claws and loose his teeth, in order that his means of offence and defence might be more equal with those of his keepers. Upon the whole, he deeply lamented that the efforts of the committee had been ineffectual, and that

had failed to induce the Chancellor of the Exchequer to alter his opinion. He condemned the as impolitic and unjust, and denied that any one ument had been urged which could be said to ve its expediency.

Mr. R. Curling said he did not think it would be difficult to convince the Chancellor of the Exquer that the profits of ship-owners, instead of creasing, were very considerably diminished. A end of his, opposite to him, had a ship of the ue of £6,000, now in the West-India trade, and had no hesitation in saying that she would not ar the least profit. At the last place he had him- six barques in the Jamaica trade, and though he derived profit from them during the war, yet mediately peace was made he suffered great loss.

Mr. Hill stated that the present state of the ship- g interest had been admitted, but at the same e it was said that it was only *momentary*, and that a very short time the trade of the country would into its channel, and of course increase.

Mr. Kennion asked whether it had been stated at e interview, that if the tax took place, in all probaity British capital would be vested in foreign bot- ms?

Mr. Akenhead said it had been so represented, and it was stated that the tax was only experimental, had been observed that such experiment might ry probably turn out fatal to Great-Britain; for ance, Spain and Holland being in want of merchant ips, they would purchase them here, and if the amen could not find employment in the carrying de of this country, they would of course go elsehere for it, the effect of which was too apparent. was then said, that many British merchants were w collusively engaged in foreign bottoms, because the power to navigate such ships cheaper than the itish owners.

Mr. Hill said, the advocates for the tax accounted r the future prosperity of British shipping, from e more favourable situation the country was said to left in by the present than by any former peace. ut when the extent of coast was considered which as under the dominion of France, her influence er the other powers of Europe, amongst whom we ad scarcely a friendly port, except perhaps in Portual, which was too weak to be an efficient ally, this sertion seemed unfortunate; the first battle which ight take place in any future war with France would ew the momentous consequences of increasing the umber of foreign bottoms. He had always objected the principle of the tax, and had been against any odification of it. If the principle was not totally enied, government might, on some occasion, conder it as admitted, and ground future measures pon such admission: and it had been mistakenly declared, that the convoy act had passed without he principle of it being objected to and condemned; ut the reason why no decided opposition was made it was, that a noble lord, now high in office, had xpressly declared, that it was not to be considered a tax or money bill, but a temporary measure to nable the Admiralty to protect more effectually the hipping of this country, by establishing more frequent convoys; and the then secretary of the treasury declared it was *a war tax, and would cease with it*. He confessed he never liked the principle, and conceived it might with as much propriety be said, hat if Scotland was invaded, they should be called pon to pay for the charges of the army sent to defend them. There was no protection offered by the convoy act but what every part of the United Kingdom participated in. The convoy act was intituled, "An Act for the *Encouragement* of British Shipping:" the very title of it is an answer to those who wished to make it a precedent for the present tax on the tonnage of shipping.

Mr. Robinson then moved a resolution, which was seconded and agreed to, "That the committee should be instructed to take such measures as might appear advisable to obtain in respect of the intended tax on the tonnage of shipping, if the same passed into a law." Various resolutions, which had been received from several of the out-ports, were then read, and they were all expressive of the dangerous tendency of the intended duty.

Mr. Akenhead said, he wished it might not be supposed that the opposition to the tax, in the House of Commons, was weak; for, on the contrary, it was very strong, and the objections extremely well urged.

Mr. Tullock asked, if any observations were made at the interview, relating to the restricting the importation of British goods and merchandize into France.

The Chairman said, that that subject had been mentioned in the conversation, and also the state of the American, French, and other foreign ships, and it was suggested that the legislature should, under the existing circumstances of the times, rather encourage than depress British shipping, which they would by persisting in this tax. He begged leave again to observe, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had heard all their observations and arguments with great candour and attention.

After this, a conversation of considerable length took place on the present state of the carrying trade of Great-Britain, adverting to the gigantic strides which France was openly and boldly making towards rivalling us in that respect on our native element, and of the preference she was avowedly holding out to all other foreign ships, to the total exclusion of British ships. It was then recommended to the ship owners in London, and at the out-ports, to co-operate more strongly, and to appoint a committee to superintend all such measures which might be brought forward respecting the shipping interest of Great-Britain; and a resolution to that effect being prepared by Mr. Robinson, it was proposed and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Tullock said, he knew that at that moment foreign ships were permitted to unload their cargoes under orders of counsel, much to the detriment of British ships.

It was then stated, that the Dutch property act remained in force for upwards of two years longer.

Mr. Tullock said, the Dutch property act was a total subversion of the navigation laws.

Mr. Hill said, he coincided most heartily in the last motion; no one could doubt the importance of the navigation acts, nor be insensible of the effects they had produced.

Several other resolutions were afterwards proposed, and the meeting then adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday (May 6) nothing of importance occurred in the House of Lords.

The next day (May 7) *Lord Minto* gave notice that, on Monday, he should move for some papers, which were necessary for the discussion of the definitive treaty. The order of the day was then read, which being

inauspicious measure. It was first stated, that the ship-owners had carried on a gainful trade during the late war, and therefore ought to contribute during the peace to the expenses the public had incurred. If, said Mr. Hill, the ship-owners did carry on an advantageous business during the war, did they not, during that period, contribute their quota by the income tax, &c. and is there any greater reason why ship-owners should be marked out as objects of taxation on account of their profits during the war, more than the farmers, compared to whom the profits of the ship-owners were nothing, and if there was any weight in that argument, the legislature might, with the same propriety, tax ploughs, harrows, and other articles of agriculture.—Much stress had been laid upon a statement of the exports and imports of this country, and the value of merchandize exported confounded with the increase of shipping, that such was by no means a fair criterion it was easy to demonstrate. He would, for example, take the comparative estimate of four years immediately preceding the war; it appeared, that in the years 1789, 1790, and 1791, taking the average of those years, that the number of tonnage of British ships cleared at the Custom-House, was 1,312,570, and of foreign ships 140,686; and the number of British ships cleared out in the year 1792 is 1,396,003, and of foreign ships 169,151, making an increase of British shipping of 83,425, or nearly one-fifteenth, and an increase of foreign shipping of 28,470, or nearly one-fifth. The value of goods exported on the average of the three former years, is £20,935,137, and in the latter year £24,905,200, being an increase of near one-fifth. If, therefore, the value of exports had increased one fifth, and in the same period the number of British ships no more than one-fifteenth, he must indeed be a bold man who would argue that the increase of one is a criterion to judge of the increase of the other. It further appeared, that instead of British shipping having increased within that time from the increase of exports and imports, that the vessels of foreigners had experienced almost all the encouragement which had arisen from that source. The numbers of foreign ships had increased one-fifth, whilst British ships, as before stated, had only increased one-fifteenth.—He had taken up this calculation at a period antecedent to the war; it was perfectly needless, he conceived, for him to state that there was an infinitely greater proportion of foreign shipping engaged in the exportation of British merchandize subsequent to that period. It was a well known fact that British shipping had since the peace fallen in value from 30 to 50 per cent.; and that there was every reason to expect a greater diminution of the carrying trade. Could it be for a moment doubted, that when Surinam, Essequibo, Demarara, and all the other possessions of the Dutch were restored, and the French possessions given up, but that there would be a far greater number of British shipping unemployed, as our naval power during the war had made this country the grand emporium of Europe.—In estimating the state of the Continent, we ought to take into our account the situation of the neighbouring states, and more particularly of those who had been our constant and natural rivals, and may, perhaps, within no long time, as they had heretofore been, be our inveterate enemies. Most justly had it been said, that as to capital, national honour, and good faith, this country stood unrivalled, and possessed spirit capable of surmounting every difficulty. To what did we owe those national characteristics of which no man was prouder than himself?—to the excellence of our constitution—the due administration of our laws—to that principle of justice, that security to persons and property which pervaded every part of the empire. But capital, like water, would always find its level; if the frenzy of revolution should subside, and resolve itself into a new system of government, by giving security to persons and property, what assurance have we that British capital will not float there? To our navigation, to those seamen who were ready trained to meet the enemy and to break his force at the first onset, to the wise system of former policy, that pursued one uniform conduct of encouraging instead of depressing British shipping—it was to this policy we principally owed all our splendid victories, our national wealth and character.—Can the achievements of British seamen be so soon forgotten?—They must long be remembered—at Camperdown—at Brest—at Cape St. Vincent—at Cadiz—at Gibraltar—and even the distant banks of the Nile. The very pyramids of Egypt had reverberated with the sound of British thunder.—It had been said that the French, in a late important expedition, were obliged to employ men of war to carry troops for want of merchant ships. By what means were they reduced to that situation? It cannot be forgotten that it was owing to the valour of British seamen which compelled the united fleets of France, Spain and Holland to hide their diminished heads in their harbours, which at the same time destroyed their commerce, and blocked up their ports and their merchant ships from the Elbe to the Gulf of Lyons, where they had rotted. And shall these men, whose services may be so soon wanted again be, from the want of employment in British shipping driven to seek it in foreign ports? Dr. Adam Smith, whom he said he might with propriety stile the philosopher of commerce, justly estimated the value of our navigation laws. He says, that "all our greatness is owing to "the navigation acts being kept strictly in force." It was a most singular circumstance that those navigation laws should be framed under the despotism of a tyrant and usurper, and that a contrary system of policy should be adopted in the reign of a patriot and paternal king, and by an enlightened and moderate minister. Mr. Hill, observing some persons taking notes, earnestly requested that what he had said might not be construed into a want of respect to the government; it was one of the greatest blessings under it, that every individual who was oppressed had his complaints attended to. Ministers were but men, and though of superior talents, could not know all things by intuition. He conceived it to be the duty of every good subject to give them the best information. They were often deceived by visionary projectors, and it was the duty of practical men to endeavour to set them right. The ship-owners had the consolation to think, that whilst they struggled for their own privileges, they were engaged on a subject which it was the interest of the whole kingdom to support. The tax was said to be only *experimental*, but he could not conceive how such an idea could be adopted by wise and considerate men. The experiment would be most impolitic; if we should ever be unable to beat the fleets of our enemies, as we had hitherto done, at the first commencement of a war, it would not only be injurious to this country, but to Europe. Really the measure reminded him forcibly of the old fable, where the lion was prevailed upon to shorten his claws and loose his teeth, in order that his means of offence and defence might be more equal with those of his keepers. Upon the whole, he deeply lamented that the efforts of the committee had been ineffectual, and that

had failed to induce the Chancellor of the Exchequer to alter his opinion. He condemned the tax as impolitic and unjust, and denied that any one argument had been urged which could be said to prove its expediency.

Mr. R. Curling said he did not think it would be very difficult to convince the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the profits of ship-owners, instead of increasing, were very considerably diminished. A friend of his, opposite to him, had a ship of the value of £6,000, now in the West-India trade, and he had no hesitation in saying that she would not clear the least profit. At the last place he had himself six barques in the Jamaica trade, and though he had derived profit from them during the war, yet immediately peace was made he suffered great loss.

Mr. Hill stated that the present state of the shipping interest had been admitted, but at the same time it was said that it was only *momentary*, and that in a very short time the trade of the country would flow into its channel, and of course increase.

Mr. Kennion asked whether it had been stated at the interview, that if the tax took place, in all probability British capital would be vested in foreign bottoms?

Mr. Akenhead said it had been so represented, and that it was stated that the tax was only experimental, and had been observed that such experiment might very probably turn out fatal to Great-Britain; for France, Spain and Holland being in want of merchant ships, they would purchase them here, and if the seamen could not find employment in the carrying trade of this country, they would of course go elsewhere for it, the effect of which was too apparent. It was then said, that many British merchants were now collusively engaged in foreign bottoms, because of the power to navigate such ships cheaper than the British owners.

Mr. Hill said, the advocates for the tax accounted for the future prosperity of British shipping, from the more favourable situation the country was said to be left in by the present than by any former peace. But when the extent of coast was considered which was under the dominion of France, her influence over the other powers of Europe, amongst whom we had scarcely a friendly port, except perhaps in Portugal, which was too weak to be an efficient ally, this assertion seemed unfortunate; the first battle which might take place in any future war with France would shew the momentous consequences of increasing the number of foreign bottoms. He had always objected to the principle of the tax, and had been against any modification of it. If the principle was not totally denied, government might, on some occasion, consider it as admitted, and ground future measures upon such admission: and it had been mistakenly declared, that the convoy act had passed without the principle of it being objected to and condemned; but the reason why no decided opposition was made to it was, that a noble lord, now high in office, had expressly declared, that it was not to be considered as a tax or money bill, but a temporary measure to enable the Admiralty to protect more effectually the shipping of this country, by establishing more frequent convoys; and the then secretary of the treasury declared it was *a war tax, and would cease with it*. He confessed he never liked the principle, and conceived it might with as much propriety be said, that if Scotland was invaded, they should be called upon to pay for the charges of the army sent to defend them. There was no protection offered by the convoy act but what every part of the United Kingdom participated in. The convoy act was intituled, "An Act for the *Encouragement* of British Shipping:" the very title of it is an answer to those who wished to make it a precedent for the present tax on the tonnage of shipping.

Mr. Robinson then moved a resolution, which was seconded and agreed to, "That the committee should be instructed to take such measures as might appear advisable to obtain in respect of the intended tax on the tonnage of shipping, if the same passed into a law." Various resolutions, which had been received from several of the out-ports, were then read, and they were all expressive of the dangerous tendency of the intended duty.

Mr. Akenhead said, he wished it might not be supposed that the opposition to the tax, in the House of Commons, was weak; for, on the contrary, it was very strong, and the objections extremely well urged.

Mr. Tullock asked, if any observations were made at the interview, relating to the restricting the importation of British goods and merchandize into France.

The Chairman said, that that subject had been mentioned in the conversation, and also the state of the American, French, and other foreign ships, and it was suggested that the legislature should, under the existing circumstances of the times, rather encourage than depress British shipping, which they would by persisting in this tax. He begged leave again to observe, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had heard all their observations and arguments with great candour and attention.

After this, a conversation of considerable length took place on the present state of the carrying trade of Great-Britain, adverting to the gigantic strides which France was openly and boldly making towards rivalling us in that respect on our native element, and of the preference she was avowedly holding out to all other foreign ships, to the total exclusion of British ships. It was then recommended to the ship owners in London, and at the out-ports, to co-operate more strongly, and to appoint a committee to superintend all such measures which might be brought forward respecting the shipping interest of Great-Britain; and a resolution to that effect being prepared by Mr. Robinson, it was proposed and unanimously agreed to.

Mr. Tullock said, he knew that at that moment foreign ships were permitted to unload their cargoes under orders of counsel, much to the detriment of British ships.

It was then stated, that the Dutch property act remained in force for upwards of two years longer.

Mr. Tullock said, the Dutch property act was a total subversion of the navigation laws.

Mr. Hill said, he coincided most heartily in the last motion; no one could doubt the importance of the navigation acts, nor be insensible of the effects they had produced.

Several other resolutions were afterwards proposed, and the meeting then adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday (May 6) nothing of importance occurred in the House of Lords.

The next day (May 7) *Lord Minto* gave notice that, on Monday, he should move for some papers, which were necessary for the discussion of the definitive treaty. The order of the day was then read, which being

done, *Lord Spencer* rose to call the attention of their lordships to the subject of the Island of Malta. After expatiating at considerable length on the importance of that island, and the evil consequences which might result from its falling into the hands of the French, he concluded by moving for an account of the territorial revenues and commercial duties of Malta, from its surrender to England to the present time. Some observations were made by *Lord Hobart* on the speech of the noble mover. The motion was supported by *Lords Carlisle, Grenville,* and *Holland*; the latter of whom declared that it was with pain he heard it proved, by the two other noble lords, that Malta was, in a great measure, surrendered to France: that we had also not a single port left us in the Mediterranean was to him a subject of great regret. The question was then put and carried.

On Monday (May 10) *Lord Holland* brought forward a motion for copies of the correspondence between his Majesty's ministers and the court of Lisbon, relative to the treaty of 1797, between France and Portugal, and also for copies of correspondence which took place between the same in 1800 and 1801. The motion was opposed by *Lords Pelham* and *Grenville,* and by the *Marquis of Sligo*; and, on the question being put, was negatived without a division. *Lord Minto* then brought forward his motion for the production of papers relative to the formation of the Italian Republic, and the cession of the Island of Elba. It was prefaced by a speech of some length, in which his lordship stated, from personal knowledge, what was the effect produced on the minds of our friends on the Continent, by the peace we had procured. So disgraceful, he said, were the terms considered, that when the preliminaries arrived at Vienna they were believed by every one to be the fabrication of France. His lordship next adverted to the establishment of the Italian Republic, and the consequences that must result from it to the system of Europe; and then, touching upon the cession of Elba, concluded by moving an address to his Majesty for such official documents as related to these transactions. The motion was opposed by *Lord Pelham,* on the ground that no such documents were in possession of government. The formation of the Italian Republic had, he allowed, excited a great degree of alarm in ministers, but it had been thought imprudent and impolitic to break off the negotiation on that account. The motions were then negatived without a division. The consideration of the definitive treaty was postponed till Thursday.

Nothing of importance came before the House on Tuesday (May 11), or on Wednesday (May 12).

The first matter, and indeed the only one of importance, that came before the House of Commons on Thursday (May 6) was the motion of *Lord Temple*, for certain papers relative to the Island of Malta. In a speech of considerable length, his lordship stated, as reasons for the production of these papers, the charge which had been made in the formation and constitution of the order; the loss of the revenues antiently belonging to the knights; the imperfect guarantee which was obtained for the neutrality of the island; and the intrigues which were, and would be carried on by France to obtain possession of an object of such importance as Malta. His lordship then proceeded to consider the usurpation of the Italian Republic, and the cession of Elba; on both which subjects he dwelt with great force of argument. The conduct of this country, with regard to objects of such importance, had not, he contended, been what it owed to its power, its interests, and its honour. In contrast to our present conduct he opposed that of the nation at a period of difficulty, distress, and disaffection. In support of his observations, his lordship read the following passage from the report of the ministers to King William the Third, in the year 1698, with Mr. Burke's statement of the conduct pursued by that sovereign under such painful circumstances.

" So far as relates to England, it would
" be want of duty not to give your Majesty
" this clear account, that there is a dead-
" ness and want of spirit in the nation
" universally, so as not to be at all dis-
" posed to enter into a new war. That
" they seem to be tired out with taxes to
" a degree beyond what was discerned, 'till
" it appeared at the last elections. This is
" the truth of the fact on which your Ma-
" jesty will determine what resolution
" ought to be taken."

His Majesty did determine, and did take and pursue his resolution. "In all the tot-
" tering imbecility of a new government,
" and with Parliament totally unmanage-
" able, he did persevere. He persevered
" to expel the fears of his people by his
" fortitude, to steady their fickleness by his
" constancy, to expand their narrow pru-
" dence by his enlarged wisdom, to sink

their factious temper in his public spirit. In spite of his people he resolved to make them great and glorious, to make England inclined to shrink into her narrow self, the arbitress of Europe, the tutelary angel of the human race. In spite of the ministers who staggered under the weight that his mind imposed upon theirs, unsupported as they felt themselves by the popular spirit, he infused into them his own soul, he renewed in them their ancient heart, he rallied them in the same cause." His lordship concluded by moving for an account of the revenues and duties of Malta; a copy of the laws and ordinances of that island, which are referred to in the 10th article of the present treaty; and for a copy of the treaty of Luneville. The first motion was agreed to; but the second and third gave rise to much debate. It was objected by ministers, and by *Mr. Pitt* and *Mr. T. Jones* in support of them, that these motions were unfair, and that they were meant to prejudice the public mind. The treaty of Luneville was sufficiently known for my public purpose, and there was no reason to suppose it officially in the hands of government. The motion was supported by *Mr. Windham*, *Sir W. Young*, and *Mr. T. Grenville*, as being perfectly consistent with fairness and propriety. It was, however, negatived. On the third head, the constitution of Malta; it was stated by ministers that, though known historically, it was not in possession of government as an official document. By the supporters of the motion it was urged, that the government, having pledged itself to support that constitution, ought, at least, to know where it might be referred to: if they did know this, they might produce it on the table in some form, even were it as a printed book. To this no satisfactory answer was given. The question was then put and negatived.

The next day (Friday, May 7) *Mr. Nicholls* brought forward his promised motion relative to the late Chancellor of the Exchequer. Tracing the measures of the late ministers, from the commencement of the war, to the time of his leaving office, the hon. gentleman contended that they were all equally censurable. The war had been undertaken to protect Holland, and deliver the Low Countries: those objects were not attained. A peace, the necessary consequences of such a war, was now concluded, which, though it should have his support, placed France in a situation which could not be viewed without alarm. At home, the liberties of the subject had been destroyed; and the strength of the country reduced. Every mode of corruption had also been employed. The hon. gentleman concluded by moving an address of thanks to his Majesty for having removed the Right Hon. W. Pitt from his councils. He was followed by *Lord Belgrave*, who entered into a very warm penegyric of the late minister, and in conclusion moved that the House should pass a vote expressive of their approbation of those measures which the hon. gentleman held forth as the objects of censure. This motion was seconded by *Mr. S. Thornton*, and gave rise to a long debate. It was first resisted on the point of order, but this being overruled, the debate was resumed. *Sir H. Mildmay* then moved, as an amendment, that the thanks of the House should be given to the Right Hon. W. Pitt for his pre-eminent services. These motions were attacked, in a long and animated speech by *Mr. Erskine*, who descanted upon the conduct of the late ministers in terms of strong indignation. The same side of the question was also taken by *Mr. Grey* and *Mr. Fox*. The defence of the late ministers was undertaken by *Mr. Wilberforce*, *Sir Robert Peele*, *Mr. Cartwright*, *Lord Hawkesbury*, *Sir H. Mildmay*, and other members. In contradiction to what had fallen from the other side of the House, it was contended that the country owed the preservation of its laws and religion, and the king that of his crown, to the measures of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer; that his conduct had displayed the highest integrity and political wisdom, and that he had been in every sense the benefactor of his country. The debate was continued till a late hour, when the original motion was put and negatived by 224 against 52. The two amendments were then withdrawn, and formed into separate motions which were carried by the same majority. Two amendments to these were moved: the one by *Mr. Fox*, the other by *Mr. Grey*. It was proposed by *Mr. Fox* to include the names of Mr. Dundas, Mr. Windham, Lord Spencer, and Lord Roslin. With this *Mr. Wilberforce* concurred. It was, however, negatived. The motion of *Mr. Grey* was to add to that of *Sir H. Mildmay* the words "by which means the pre-"sent administration were enabled to con-"clude a safe, honourable, and glorious "peace!" This also was negatived. The House did not rise till half past six in the morning.

The House was principally occupied on

Monday (May 10) with the ordinary business of the day. Several sums were voted in a committee of supply, which gave rise to many observations from *Mr. Robson*. The motion of *Dr. Laurence* was postponed till the next day.

On Tuesday (May 11) *Lord Hawkesbury* moved that the definitive treaty should be taken into consideration on Thursday instead of Wednesday, for which day the order originally stood. It was contended on this motion, by several members, that, as several of the papers to be moved for, could not be laid on the table in time to assist the discussion of the treaty, some further delay should be allowed. Monday was, therefore, proposed to be named instead of Thursday. This proposition was supported by *Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Dent*, and other members; but was resisted by ministers, who declared that it was of public consequence that the discussion should take place as early as possible. The day moved by *Lord Hawkesbury* was adopted, after a division on the amendment. *General Gascoyne* then rose to move for several papers relative to our West-India possessions. The hon. gentleman went at considerable length into the subject. By the non-renewal of treaties, he urged that we were precluded from that trade on the coasts of Honduras and of Senegal, which was indispensably necessary for our manufactures. In consequence of that non-renewal, prohibitions upon our trade to those parts had already taken place. He then adverted to that article of the treaty by which British subjects were empowered to withdraw themselves from the islands and possessions restored to the enemy. This article he demonstrated to be ineffectual. Ten millions and a half of British capital was invested in these possessions, which, by this treaty, we were without the means of withdrawing from them. By this capital the value of the French and Dutch possessions had been trebled, and it must still remain there, as, contrary to all usage, no stipulation had been made for bringing it away, though innumerable memorials had been presented to ministers on the subject, long previous to the signing of the definitive treaty. He, therefore, should move for a copy of an explanation which might have taken place between the two governments on this subject. This motion was opposed by *Lord Hawkesbury, Mr. Vansittart*, and others. By *Lord Hawkesbury*, it was contended that every thing had been done by his Majesty's ministers that was possible, but that it was necessary in negotiation to consider the whole, and on that ground it might sometimes be necessary to concede a part; that, however, it might be proper to consider British subjects, those who invested property in conquered colonies were not entitled to so high a degree of consideration as should be shown to others, since they vested their property under all risks. He, therefore, opposed the motion, which was negatived. A second and third motion, for an account of dying woods, gums and mahogany imported into Great-Britain, was carried. The last, which was for an account of prohibitions imposed on British commerce since signing the preliminaries, was negatived.

The next day (Wednesday May 12) the motion of *Dr. Laurence*, which at the request of Lord Hawkesbury had been postponed to this day, was brought forward. It was opened by the learned doctor in a speech of great length and argument. In this speech, admitting to the fullest extent our right of sovereignty in India as against foreign powers, though waving the question of its acquirement, he traced and illustrated the claims of foreign powers, and the manner in which they had been advanced. France, it was already demonstrated, had never ceased to assert rights injurious even to our existence there. The claims of France had indeed been set at rest by treaties, but those treaties were abrogated. Every thing was therefore left loose on its original ground, and France might at any moment put the question to the decision of the sword. The same was to be observed with respect to our free navigation of the Eastern Seas; a point which has long been disputed by the Dutch, and which was at last settled by a treaty now, like all others, done away. On this point, it was to be observed, that by the treaty of alliance between France and Holland, if we contended with one power we must contend with both. The question of combat, therefore, could not be with Holland, but with France and Holland, and, it was vain to expect that any question of the kind would be settled by Indian armies, or on the shores of India by the two countries. No, the quarrel would come to an issue nearer home. To prevent these effects, the various treaties, which bound down the French influence in India, ought to have been renewed. After going with great perspicuity into every part of this subject, the hon. gentleman concluded, by moving for various papers intimately connected with, and illustrative of the subject which

he had brought before the House. The motion was opposed by *Mr. T. Jones*, *Mr. H. Dundas*, and *Lord Hawkesbury*. By the two latter gentlemen it was contended that the sovereignty of India was allowed to belong to Great-Britain; that any thing granted to the French, in those treaties, was merely a matter of favour; and that, therefore, France could set up no claims against us; or if she did, which was not to be expected, we might justly repel them by force of arms. With respect to the obstruction, by the Dutch, of our navigation to China, through the straits of Molacca, it was treated as a mere bagatelle, as a matter not worthy of argument, though, at the same time, it was allowed, that from one to two hundred sail of British vessels yearly passed through those straits. Some of the papers moved for, it was said, by *Lord Hawkesbury*, were not proper to be given; some would at other times have been indifferent; but all ought now to be refused, because there was no ground for an enquiry into the question brought forward by the hon. mover. To this it was answered by *Lord Temple*, *Mr. T. Grenville*, and *Dr. Laurence*, that no attempt had been made by the hon. mover, or his friends, to deny the sovereignty of this country, but merely a wish expressed that measures might be taken to prevent that sovereignty from being debated by our rivals at the point of the sword, after we had given up the security which we at present held by our possession of the Cape and Cochin. With respect to there being a ground of enquiry, it was said, that it would be more decent for ministers to leave that to the House, than to pass judgment themselves. What ill effect could result from the production of these papers? They disclosed no state secrets, but merely went to give the House the necessary information. The questions were then put, and negatived without a division.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

Paris, May 6.—A report having been circulated that the importation of English merchandize, particularly the English manufacture of China and Delf Ware, would be permitted by government, the minister of the interior has formally contradicted this report, by stating that the law of October 1797, which prohibits the importation of English manufactures, is still in force. And orders have been given to the officers of the customs, not only to prevent the importation of such merchandize, but to discover whether any has been imported, in order that the law which orders it to be seized may carried into execution.

The merchants of Pondicherry, and the Isles of France and of Réunion, at Paris, have presented to government a memorial against all exclusive privilege, and claiming, in the name of those three factories, the indefinite freedom of commerce.

We are assured that government is occupied in the examination of the great question so long disputed, Whether privileged companies are useful or prejudicial to the mother country?

DOMESTIC OCCURRENCES.

The Duke of Cambridge is preparing for his journey to Hanover. Previous notice has been sent to the Lords of the Regency, to make suitable preparations for His Royal Highness's reception, it being expected that in future he will make that Electorate his chief residence.

On Monday, after a contest of five days, Sir Henry Peyton was elected member for the county of Cambridge. The numbers were,

For Sir H. Peyton - - - -	1592
Lord Ch. Somerset Manners	1500
Majority -	92

A subscription is opened at Lloyd's Coffee-house for raising a sum of money for the purpose of "erecting a statue of "the Rt. Hon. Wm. Pitt, late First Lord "of the Treasury, and Chancellor of the "Exchequer, for the distinguished and valuable services which he has rendered to "his country, during the course of his able "and upright administration." About a thousand pounds have been subscribed in the course of eight days. It appears also, from an advertisement in the news-papers, that Mr. Pitt's birth-day is to be commemorated, on the 28th instant, at the London Tavern, in the same manner as that of Mr. Fox has been for many years past.

On Thursday last the mayor and sheriffs of London presented to His Majesty an address on the conclusion of Peace.

At a meeting of the county of Berks, held at Reading, on the 6th instant, an address was voted to His Majesty on the conclusion of the Definitive Treaty.

His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales's answer to the Letter of the Sheriffs of London, respecting their non-attendance at the Mansion-House on Easter Monday.

(Copy.)

"*Carlton-House, April* 21, 1802.

"Gentlemen,

"I am commanded by the Prince of Wales to say, it is matter of unfeigned concern to his Royal Highness to find his not having had the pleasure of meeting you in the City on Monday last, was owing to any misconception between you and the Lord Mayor; for his Royal Highness must lament, that a shadow of dissatisfaction to any one, should arise out of a day which will always stand most gratefully distinguished in his recollection. I am directed to add, that his Rowal Highness's regret cannot but be the more lively, when the circumstance refers to persons so prominent in official station, and in private character, as you are.

"His Royal Highness is convinced that whilst you accept the expression of his concern, as applying to you individually, and whilst you give credit for perfect sensibility to your obliging declarations of attachment, you will feel the propriety of his abstaining from any allusion to the question of claims, on which he cannot hold himself at all entitled to judge.

"I am, Gentlemen, your most obedient humble servant,

"*Thomas Tyrwhitt.*"

Copy of a Letter from Evan Nepean, Esq. Secretary to the Admiralty, to the Commanders in Chief at the Ports of Portsmouth, Plymouth, Sheerness, and Chatham, dated the 26th of April, 1802.

"Sir,

"I am commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to signify their direction to you to acquaint the Captains and Commanders of his Majesty's ships and vessels which may be ordered to be paid off at Portsmouth, that, in order to give employment to many Master's-Mates and Midshipmen as possible, their Lordships have increased the number of Petty Officers to be borne on board the ships and vessels intended to be employed in time of peace; and that such of the Master's-Mates and Midshipmen who have passed for Lieutenants, or who may have already served their time to qualify themselves to pass, and are desirous of employment without being able to obtain it, should make known their wishes to me, the latter stating the times of their service, and transmitting the certificates of the Captains or Commanders with whom they have last served, of their behaviour during such service.

"I am, Sir, &c.

"*Evan Nepean.*"

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

The parliamentary discussion of the Definitive Treaty has occupied another week of the public attention, which seems to have been constantly turned towards this important object. On Thursday night, Lord Grenville, at the close of a speech of three hours and three quarters, moved an address to His Majesty in the following words:

"That an humble address be presented to His Majesty, to assure His Majesiy that we have taken into our most serious consideration the Definitive Treaty of Peace, which His Majesty has been graciously pleased to communicate to this House.

"That we acknowledge with all humility and submission His Majesty's undoubted prerogative of making peace and war: and that we shall consider it to be our first duty, as far as may depend on us, to maintain inviolate the public faith, as it is pledged by this Treaty, and to assist His Majesty in performing with uprightness and punctuality, the engagements into which His Majesty has been advised to enter.

"But that we cannot conceal the painful apprehensions, with which we consider the result of those engagements; nor can we forbear to offer to His Majesty our humble and dutiful advice, for the adoption of such measures, as can alone, in our opinion, under the blessing of Providence, avert from us the dangers with which we are now surrounded.

"That it is impossible for us to have seen without the utmost anxiety and alarm, all the unexampled circumstances which have attended the final conclusion of the present peace: the extensive and important sacrifices, which, without any corresponding concession, this Treaty has added to those already made, on our part, by the preliminary articles: the unlooked-for and immense accessions of territory, influence, and power, which it has tacitly confirmed to France: the numerous subjects of clashing interest and unavoidable dispute, which it has left entirely unadjusted: and above all, those continued and systematic projects of aggrandisement, of which, in the very moment of peace, we have seen unhappily such undeniable and convincing evidence.

"That by relinquishing so many sources of prosperity in Peace, and so many bulwarks of defence in war, and by renouncing at the same time the advantage and security always hitherto derived from the accustomed renewal of former treaties, the British Government has imposed on itself a greater necessity than has ever before existed, for measures of increased precaution, and for determinations of unshaken constancy.

"That we therefore rely on His Majesty's paternal wisdom for a watchful and unremitted attention to the situation and future conduct of the power with whom we have negotiated. And we think it peculiarly

y more especially to assure His Majesty of our dy and firm support in that determination ich we trust His Majesty will henceforward stea- pursue, of resisting every fresh encroachment whatever nature), which shall be attempted on maritime, commercial, or colonial rights and crests of the British Empire.

" This our solemn declaration must, as we be- ve, materially conduce to prevent the necessity hich it is calculated to meet. And we trust that s Majesty will also approve of our desire to sup- rt it by all practicable œconomy, in every nch of the public expenditure, and by a scale naval and military defence adequate to the extent our danger, and to the importance of the interests hich we have to maintain

" The anxiety which we feel in this respect is the cessary consequence of our sincere wish for the rmanence of the public tranquillity which His jesty has now re-established. And it is for the e important purpose that we also most earnestly commend to His Majesty's wisdom, the pressing cessity of arranging, by immediate and amicable cussion, those points of essential interest, which d been adjusted by former treaties, but for which provision has been made in this negotiation.

" These councils we submit to His Majesty with nfidence, in the present awful crisis of public af- rs, prepared to meet with firmness all the difficul- s and dangers of our present situation, but desirous ve all thinks to promote the stability and security real peace: the object which it has been His Ma- ty's benevolent desire, by such extensive sacri- es, to ensure to his loyal and affectionate people."

An amendment was proposed by the uke of Norfolk, and a counter-amend- ent by Lord Pelham. The House divid- d at seven o'clock in the morning, after a bate of fourteen hours. For Lord Gren- lle's motion there appeared 16; against including proxies, 122. A motion, in ery respect similar to that of Lord Gren- lle, was, on the same evening, made, in e House of Commons, by Mr. Windham. he House of Commons adjourned the de- te at four o'clock yesterday morning. It as resumed last night, and ended this orning at half past four o'clock. For Mr. indham's motion there were 20, against 276.

In the course of these debates some very rious and interesting matter has transpir- d. Several assertions and avowals have en made, which it will be of great mo- ent to put upon record, to illustrate, and circulate widely. Lord Grenville's peech we had the good fortune to hear, d we hope that the public will be fur- shed with an opportunity of reading it; ot in the garbled state in which it must ecessarily find its way into a news-paper, ut at full length, and as near as possible the same order and the same words in hich it was delivered. After examining detail the several parts of the compli- ated and extensive subject, his lordship ook a view of it as a whole, and in all the different lights in which it could possibly present itself. His arrangement was new and uncommonly perspicuous; his language was elegant, his manner dignified, and his arguments were irresistible. If the whole nation could have been assembled to hear that speech, previous to the proclamation of peace, neither the example of the ministers, nor the dread of the myrmidons from the Post-Office, would have extorted an illumination, even from the ignorant and cowardly people of London and Westminster.

The depression, which, as our readers will perceive, the funds have experienced, during the last week, has been ascribed to several causes; but we think the chief is, the newly repeated resolution of France not to enter into any commercial treaty with this country, and not to suffer British goods, on any account, to enter her own dominions or the dominions of any of the powers, which she holds within her talons. Her inflexibility, in this respect, grows daily stronger and stronger; and those who now doubt of her intentions to destroy the commerce and navigation of England must labour under an infatuation equal to that, which, on our part, produced the treaty of Amiens.

In another part of the Register, will be found an account of the proceedings of the meeting of ship-owners, to which we beg leave to direct the particular attention of our readers. They will find from those proceedings, that our prediction with respect to the decline of our navigation is already but too fully verified. At every former peace, this navigation increased, a circumstance which led unreflecting men, to suppose that the present peace would be productive of similar effects. Those men will be most cruelly disappointed; and when, as the ship-owners predict, our ships and our seamen have passed into the service of our enemies, then will the senseless clamourers for peace feel what it is to purchase that "blessing" on terms such as those, of which they have now the folly, not to say the baseness, to approve.

From France, from that country to whose imperious will we are in future to look for our destiny, news of great importance was last night received. Not of the death of Buonaparté; no, nor of any of those convulsions, which some weak people imagined would spring up out of peace, and would enervate the arm of the First Consul; but of a change of a very different complexion indeed; of a change whence

we may probably derive the consolation of not being the vassals of any thing less than a *king* or an *emperor*. On the 8th instant the Senate passed an arrêt, constituting Buonaparté Consul for *twenty* years. Upon the presentation of this arrêt, the pious youth modestly observed, that he had fondly hoped, that the term of his political existence would end with his ten years consulship; but that, since the nation wished for a longer continuation of his services, he yielded to its solicitations. Taking advantage of this complying mood, the two other Consuls issued an arrêt on the 10th instant, by which the French people *(le peuple souverain)* are ordered to meet, in primary assemblies, and signify their will, in the space of six weeks, whether Buonaparté shall be Consul for *life*, or not. This intelligence is contained in the Moniteur of the 11th instant, at which time the funds were up to 60¾, a rise of 4 per cent. in one day.

We have not time to comment on this proceeding; but we beg leave to remind our readers of our prediction, expressed in the Register, p. 124.

☞ *Complete sets of this work may be had by applying to any of the newsmen, or of Messrs. Cobbett and Morgan, Pall Mall. The Register leaves town by the Saturday's post, and goes, post-free, to every part of the kingdom.*

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

War-Office, May 11, 1802.

His Majesty has been pleased to appoint Lieut. Generals J. Leland, J. Hamilton, John Stratton, James Rooke, Charles Crosbie, John Earl of Suffolk, Honourable Chapple Norton, George Hotham, David Dundas, Sir Robert Abercromby, K. B. Gerard Lake, Sir Thomas Musgrave, Bart. James Coates, Ralph Dundas, Richard Whyte, Sir Alured Clarke, K. B. to be Generals in the Army.

Major-Generals A. Farrington, J. Stuart, Charles Horneck, John Whyte, Andrew John Drummond, Henry Bowyer, John William Egerton, Peter Hunter, Joseph Walton, Ellis Walker, William Johnstone, William Maxwell, George Earl of Pembroke, John Earl of Chatham, Alexander Campbell, William Morshead, Francis Dundas, Alexander Ross, Abraham D'Aubant, Honourable Francis Needham, Henry Pigot, to be Lieutenant-Generals in the Army.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

Birth.—On the 8th inst. at his Lordship's seat, Osterley Park, the Countess of Westmoreland, of a son.

Marriages.—On Saturday, at St. George's, Hanover Square, Gilbert Mathison, Esq. to Miss Farquhar, eldest daughter of Sir Walter Farquhar, Bart.

PRICES OF THE PUBLIC FUNDS.

	SAT.	MON.	TUE.	WED.	THU.	FRI.
Bank Stock	—	—	190	—	—	—
3 per Cent Red. Ann.	75⅛	73⅞	73⅜	73⅜	73⅜	73⅜
3 per Cent Consols..	76⅛	74⅞	74⅜	74⅜	74⅜	74⅜
4 per Cent Consols..	90¼	90	88⅞	89½	89⅛	89⅛
5 per Cent Ann.....	102½	102¼	101⅝	102⅛	102⅛	102⅛
Imp. 3 per Cent Ann.	—	—	71½	72⅛	72⅛	72⅛
5 per Cent 1797....	104½	104⅜	103⅝	104	104⅛	103⅞
Bank Long Ann....	21⅛	21	20⅞	20⅞	21¼	20⅞
Bank Short Ann....	5	—	—	5	—	5
India Stock.....	—	—	—	—	—	—
Omnium.....	2⅛	1½	1¼	1½	1½	1⅝
Exch. Bills, New...	—	8s pr	8s pr	8s pr	—	—
Irish 5 per Cent....	—	—	—	—	—	—

AMERICAN STOCKS.—Eight pr. c. 113.
FRENCH STOCKS.—Tiers Consolidé, 60 f. 75 c.

PRICES CURRENT IN LONDON.

	s.	s.		s.	s.
Eng. Wheat per q.	56	to 72	Hops per cwt...	82	to 161
Foreign.....	48	.. 70	Hay per load	37	.. 91
Rye.....	34	.. 39	Beef, per stone....	5s. to 5s. 6d.	
Barley.....	30	.. 34			
Malt.....	36	.. 46	Mutton..	6s. 8d.	to 7s. 6d.
Oats.....	12	.. 19	Veal	6s.	to 7s.
Pease.....	27	.. 33	Pork....	6s.	to 6s. 9d.
Beans.....	30	.. 38	Tallow	4s. 0d.	
Flour per sack ..	50	..	Average of Sugar per cwt.....	33s. 5¼d.	
Seconds.....	44	.. 50			
Coals per chal....	29	.. 38			

Bread *Nine Pence Farthing* the Quartern Loaf.
Porter Four Pence Halfpenny per Pot.

LONDON COURSE OF EXCHANGE.

AMSTER.	C.F.	10 15 2 us.	LEGHORN 51
D°, at sight		10 12	NAPLES..... 44
ROTTERDAM..		10 16 2 us.	GENOA 47½
HAMBURGH..		31 72½ us.	LISBON..... 68½
ALTONA		32 8 2½ us.	OPORTO..... 68½
PARIS	2 us ..	22 13 liv.	DUBLIN..... 11½
BOURDEAUX,	d°	23 14	VENICE, 57 livres piccole effective per £. ster.
CADIZ....		34 in paper	
DITTO		36½ effective	BILBOA..... 37 D°
MADRID ..		34 in paper	PALERMO ....
DITTO		37¼ effective	AGIO, bank on Hol. p.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE WEATHER,

Near Guildford, in Surrey, for the Month of May, 1802.

Days.	M's Age	Weather.	Winds. M.	Winds. A.	Barometer. Inches. M.	Barometer. Inches. A.	Thermometer. Degrees M.	Thermometer. Degrees A.
6		Fair.	NE	NE	30,1	30,07	50	53
7		Fair.	E	E	29,09	29,97	50	57
8		Fine.	E	S	29,75	29,75	51,8	63
9	☾	Fine.	WSW	WSW	29,81	29,82	52,5	66
10		Fine.	NNE	NNE	29,87	29,9	53	61
11		Fine.	W	W	30	29,93	53	63
12		Fine.	NW	NW	29,89	29,85	56	59

● *New Moon* ☾ *1st. Quar.* ○ *F. Moon.* ☽ *last Quar.*
May 14, a few flakes of snow in London.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.
Published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where all the former numbers may be had.